IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 1123 of 1991
with
SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION NO 3677 OF 1990
WITH
SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION NO 3162 OF 1990

For Approval and Signature:

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE H.K.RATHOD

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the concerned Magistrate/Magistrates,Judge/Judges,Tribunal/Tribunals? : NO

M D SOLANKI

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT

Appearance:

MR KS JHAVERI for Petitioner No. 1-11
MR DIPAK C RAVAL for Petitioner No. 1-11
Mr. R.C. Kodekar, AGP for Respondent No. 1
Mr. SI Nanavati, Sr. Advocate and Ms. SN Pahwa, KM Patel for the respondents.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE H.K.RATHOD

Date of decision: 20/02/2004

ORAL JUDGEMENT

Learned advocate Mr. Jaykar Patel is appearing for Mr. K.S. Jhaveri and Mr. D.C. Raval is appearing for Mr. M.R. Anand for the petitioners. Learned AGP Mr. Kodekar, learned advocate Mr. D.V. Patel, Ms. Sangeetaben N. Pahwa, Mr. K.M. Patel and the learned Senior Advocate Mr. S.I. Nanavati are appearing for the respondents in these petitions. In all, three petitions have been filed before this court. Special Civil Application No. 1123 of 1991 is filed by the learned advocate Mr. Jhaveri whereas special civil application no. 3677 of 1990 is filed by Mr. M.R. Anand and Special Civil Application No. 3162 of 1990 is filed by the learned advocate Mr. K.S. Jhaveri.

Now, both the learned advocates namely Mr. Jaykar Patel and D.C. Raval who are representing Mr. K.S.Jhaveri and Mr. M.R. Anand respectively have jointly submitted before this court that in view of the interim order passed by this court, now, the matter is not surviving and, therefore, no further orders are required to be made on merits as the respondent company is also closed.

Therefore, considering the submissions made by the learned advocates Mr. Raval and Mr. Patel, these petitions have become infructuous and does not require any order on merits and are, therefore, required to be disposed of as having become infructuous. Accordingly, these petitions are disposed of as having become infructuous. Rule in each of the petitions is discharged. Interim relief, if any, shall stand vacated with no order as to costs.

(H.K. Rathod,J.)

Vyas